

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

FREE SCHOOL LANE
CAMBRIDGE CB2 3RH
TEL: CAMBRIDGE (0223) 334540
FAX: CAMBRIDGE (0223) 334554

PROFESSOR MICHAEL REDHEAD FBA
CHAIRMAN OF DEPARTMENT

26.2.96

Dear Patrick,

I am pleased to say our paper has finally been accepted by Bob Cohen for inclusion in the Shimony Festschrift he is editing.

Ghirardi is not very pleased with us (for that reason I have now put my name as first author, so as to shield you from his bad feeling!) But I am convinced that Ghirardi is just plain wrong, not so much about the counterfactuals, which is admittedly controversial, but about the status of violating DN-Loc vis-à-vis peaceful coexistence.

I enclose copies of the long-drawn-out and at times acrimonious correspondence with Gian Carlo, so as to bring you thoroughly up-to-date on the whole matter.

I trust your medical physics research
P.J.R.

is going well.

Talal Debs is planning to join us again next session for a Ph.D. proposal (the Tunn paper is coming out shortly in A.J.P.).

Karschhorst and Berkowitz has both now got their Ph.D.'s and

Pagnis has submitted and awaits his Viva, so the group continues to flourish.

Write and let me know how you are getting on, if you have a spare moment.

With best wishes

Michael

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

FREE SCHOOL LANE
CAMBRIDGE CB2 3RH
TEL: CAMBRIDGE (01223) 334540
FAX: CAMBRIDGE (01223) 334554

PROFESSOR MICHAEL REDHEAD FBA
CHAIRMAN OF DEPARTMENT

14.2.96

Dear Jeremy,

I enclose the complete set of
the G.C. correspondence including the
latest version of the paper submitted to
Cohen. I have changed the title and
'watered down' the style as much as
possible.

With regard to his letter to you,
Jeremy, I would make the following
points

- 1) I agree that my discussion of Lewis
is controversial
- 2) To me the more substantial point is
whether OM-LC is a case-by-case version
of outcome independence or, as I maintain, &

parameters independence.

- 3) The claim that the discussion of indeterminism is pointless, I reject, since otherwise I claim, one cannot argue for peaceful coexistence!
- 4.) The paper was never rejected by Goldstein et al (so far as I know) and was never submitted to them.
- 5.) Cushing saw an early draft, but never "told me to send it" to G.C." I did that off my own bat with admittedly some delay the reasons for which I explained in my letter of 18.9.95.

G.C. does not seem to have accepted my explanations at all, or to acknowledge my force in the argument about DOL - (he has not so far responded to my letter of 21.1.96).

So I doubt if there is anything more I can do, except withdraw the paper, which is the one thing I am not prepared to do.

So sorry to have conflicted you on all this
Best. Michael

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

FREE SCHOOL LANE
CAMBRIDGE CB2 3RH
TEL: CAMBRIDGE (0223) 334540
FAX: CAMBRIDGE (0223) 334554

PROFESSOR MICHAEL REDHEAD FBA
CHAIRMAN OF DEPARTMENT

7.2.96

Dear Gian Carlo,

Jeremy Butterfield tells me
you are still unhappy with the
title of our paper and the 'hard-hitting'
style. I have accordingly revised it
again to try and meet these
points. With regard to submitting
it to Cohen, I believe it is quite
proper to publish critical or controversial
material in a Festschrift, provided
the arguments are clearly laid out.
I have certainly done so on a number
of occasions in the past. But that
decision would of course be up to
Cohen.

With very best wishes
Michael